

REMARKS**I. Status**

The Office Action indicates claims 7-13, 55-58, and 95-98 to be pending in this application. With this response, claims 7, 11, 55, 57, 95, and 97 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 7-13, 55-58, and 95-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn (<http://www.w3.org/2000/12/drm-ws/pp/versaware-hahn.html>), Menezes (MENEZES, A. et al. "Ch. 13 Key Management Techniques," CRC Press, Inc., 1997, XP-02423026, pp. 548-572), and Poorvi (<http://www.w3.org/2000/12/drm-ws/pp/hp-poorvi2.html>).

Claims 7, 11, 55, 57, 95, and 97 are independent.

II. Amendment of Independent Claims 7, 11, 55, 57, 95, and 97

With this response Applicants amend independent claims 7, 11, 55, 57, 95, and 97. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... a usage state record, wherein the usage stage record
enforces play limits ...”

as set forth in each of claims 7, 55, and 95 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

As another example, the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... a usage state record ... wherein the usage state record
enforces play limits ...”

as set forth in each of claims 11, 57, and 97 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully observe, for instance, that Poorvi fails to disclose, teach, or suggest such enforcement of play limits, and instead merely discusses logging (e.g., logging in order to determine what payment is to be made):

“[t]here are two essential steps in current rights management systems that violate the privacy of the consumer, or, in b2b situations, the commercial buyer ... The second step that violates privacy is the tracking step. The amount and quality of tracking information that can be generated for digital media differs by many orders of magnitude from that generated for physical media, and it can be very granular and accurate. A usage log for a single user can itself be a fairly valuable digital asset, often more valuable than the asset whose use it logs ...

Tracking of digital media is also useful in a closed digital media publishing system (like a commercial printing workflow) where the players may be assumed to be trusted and payments are made based on the amount of usage of individual assets. In highly trusted, closed systems, this might be the only expression of rights management” (see Poorvi sect. 2 paras. 2-4; emphasis added).

As a further example, the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... wherein all devices in the authorized domain have ability to decrypt the encrypted content key, and

wherein said all devices are devices of one or more of a user and a family”

as set forth in each of claims 7, 55, and 95 as amended herewith (emphasis added), and as similarly set forth in claim 57 as amended herewith.

As an additional example, the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... wherein all devices in the first authorized domain have ability to decrypt the encrypted content key, and

wherein said all devices in the first authorized domain are devices of one or more of a user and a family”

as set forth in each of claims 11 and 97 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

As another example, the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... the voucher including an encrypted content key ...”

as set forth in each of claims 7, 11, 55, 57, 95, and 97 (emphasis added).

The Office Action states that:

“Hahn does teach voucher and content key. What else is content key used if not to protect content?”
(see Office Action p. 2).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that even if, for the sake of argument, Hahn is taken to teach a voucher and to teach a content key that protects content, such would not at all be disclosure, teaching, or suggestion, for instance, of a voucher that includes an encrypted content key.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 11, 55, 57, 95, and 97 at least with the amendments herewith, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

III. Dependent Claims

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4040.

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:



Angus R. Gill
Registration No. 51,133

Dated: March 25, 2008

Mailing Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8746
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)